MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT RMS WORKSHOP
12:30 – 2:30 P.M.
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

1. Review the first draft of the Sediment Management Resource Management Strategy (RMS)
2. Obtain feedback on suggested edits.

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

A workshop was held on June 7, 2012 to discuss revisions to the Sediment Management RMS. Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator, reviewed the agenda for the workshop and introductions were made around the room and on the phone. Ms. Beutler remarked that initial reviewers had provided some highly technical comments and they were encouraged to read through the tracked changes to make sure that the text accurately reflects their suggestions.

Overview

The Sediment Management RMS looks at erosion and sediment processes, with special attention to flood dynamics and the historical context. Three areas of the sediment management are discussed: upland (to prevent erosion); instream (dam and fishery considerations); and coastal (beach replenishment and ports). The remainder of the RMS discusses benefits, costs (of implementation) and recommendations for sediment management. It was noted that recommendations must be linked to an earlier RMS entry to either leverage best practices or overcome challenges. The recommendations do not indicate who would be responsible for implementation. The document closes with several case studies, which are intended to demonstrate a point. Participants were encouraged to consider whether better case studies are available for the RMS.

Document Walk Through

It was emphasized that the document is designed to describe the State's policy on sediment management and is not a reference for how to implement management activities. Participants were asked to consider whether there is a better way to structure the discussion on sediment management. Input was also sought on where to streamline, change or expand text – as well as whether the information was accurate and current. Comments on the document section are provided below.

Sediment Management in California

- Look at expanding the discussion for Northern and Southern California
- ACTION ITEM: Send to Celeste Cantu (SAWPA) for information regarding the Santa Ana River.

- Provide additional discussion on meanders in the waterbed. (Santa Clara County's efforts on the Santa Clara River could provide content on oxbows.)
- Sediment issues are very different throughout the state. For example, Southern California really manages for debris flows.
- Issues regarding climate change and alluvial flooding need to be added.
- There was a discussion on what constitutes sediment. Is it any solid that falls out? Are organic materials (e.g. cereal) part of the conversation – or just minerals? Phosphorous and organic sediments are contributing to low levels of oxygen in the Port of Stockton. In the Bay area, the role of both organic and inorganic compounds are being looked at in terms of how marsh systems develop. There are unregulated discharges of organic matter.
- ACTION ITEM: Betty Yee will send text to clarify the 303(d) discussion – river bodies can be listed as impaired without TMDLs being set.
- There may be cases where the current standards are not stringent enough to protect water quality.

Erosion and Sedimentation

- Consider a text box regarding fire events.
- A key challenge in the Bay area is the decreased sediment supply from the Delta, resulting from decreased flows. This causes downstream issues for both fine- and course-grained sediment. Fines can travel with very little flow.
- There are also depositions in Bay-area marinas with associated management costs.
- Note that sediment is as natural a component of a river system as is water. Sediment distribution is the key. Both water and sediment can be managed.
- ACTION ITEM: Create a separate section on debris – look at the links to Urban Water Management and Urban Runoff. Stormwater takes in materials other than sediment.
- ACTION ITEM: Send URL for links to 2009 RMSs.
- Shorten the text box (of definitions) on page 4 of handout.

Sediment and Flood

- ACTION ITEM: Brenda Goeden and Elizabeth Patterson will provide text on how water control measures prevent the movement of sediment.

Historic Context

- ACTION ITEM: Elizabeth Patterson will provide text from State Lands regarding the Delta.
- The quality of soil, especially in the Central Valley, is a factor.
- Additional discussion of agriculture is needed (work with CDFA and NRCS).
- For Southern California, talk about implications of oil activities and dams on debris.
- For Northern California, talk about the implications of logging.
- ACTION ITEM: Bruce Gwynne will help with text regarding the Trinity, Klamath and Eel rivers. (See: additional system alteration, top of Page 7.)
- Add a section to discuss current practices and activities that contribute to sedimentation.

Management Focus

- ACTION ITEM: Craig Conner will send sediment process graphic from the coastal sediment management workgroup.
- ACTION ITEM: Brenda Goedon will try a sample cut for breaking out the management sections (see notes in parens for following topics).

Uplands Management (consider changing title to sediment sources)

- The discussion here focuses on one prong, mass wasting. The second prong is to operate the water infrastructure more harmoniously with sediment movement.
- First paragraph: There are several activities that cause issues and the RMS never comes back to these. For example, recreation activities and CalTrans activities. The Water Boards require stormwater construction permits for disturbances of one acre or more. The Water Boards have also been encouraging local ordinances to address erosion control and grading requirements, for small projects. Connections should be made to other RMSs. Betty Yee will provide language.
- The Ag Lands Stewardship RMS might have much of this covered. Send to Ed and Becky for review of ag elements.
- Bruce: Page 8, lines 22-23: This is not accurate. Who develops permits and BMPs? All agencies do BMPs.
- Page 8, lines 24-27: Stormwater BMPs should discuss non-point source program. Get some additional language from Steve Agundas (pollution preventions RMS).
- Watershed stewardship is encouraged through Department of Conservation local assistance land use planning grants.
- The State Water Board adopted the watershed initiative, which includes hydrologic modification (one of the categories of non-point source) and relates to watershed management.
- ACTION ITEM: Send to John Kingsbury at Mountain Counties Water Resources Association for review and comment.

Instream Management (consider changing title to in-water management)

- This section includes dam removal and dredging – does watershed management belong here? How much dredging occurs instream? (Clarification: in port and in channel are considered instream activities). Estuarine, coastal and off-coast locations are where the majority of dredging occurs.
- Instream needs to include dredging of reservoirs, which is different from dam removal. You have a reference. Carmel (removal and diversion), Matilda (removal). Marie and Marie will provide examples.
- This section is where energy balances should be discussed.

Coastal Management (this is really about deposition areas)

- Should this section discuss deposition areas in terms of built environments (ports) v. non-built environments (beaches)?

Potential Benefits

- Look to add text.
- Clarify and correct text where needed.
- There was a discussion on the beneficial reuse of dredge materials for economic gain and a rent charge for land use (by the State Lands Commission) of $0.22 cents per cubic charge. ACTION ITEM: Check on this.
- Include cost avoidance.

Potential Costs

- Per acre costs are for plug and pond. Good numbers are needed for costs. Some numbers are available from Tahoe – which may not be representative.
- This section needs to clarify costs now and the return on investments, including environmental benefits and avoided costs. Consider life-cycle costing.

Major Issues

This section will discuss barriers or factors that need to be taken into account to successfully deliver a sediment management program.

- No comments received.

Recommendations

Recommendations must address issues or benefits and must tie directly to how the topic is framed in the chapter. Recommendations should not be overly controversial.

- Recommendations 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 and 18 deal with the science, data and analytical tools behind sediment management. Science and data considerations need to be included in the Major Issues section.
- Identify responsible parties and consider performance metrics (who does what by when).

Case Studies

- Oakland is a good example of something that's happening that is better than what was happening before.

References

There references section will capture direct citations and related reading.

- No comments received.

Next Steps

A revised draft will be generated for the July 15th version of this RMS. Additional revisions will be made in the fall with broader input.

Attendance

In person:

Becky Challendar, USDA, NRCS
Craig Conner, US Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco
Marie Davis, Placer County Water Agency
Brenda Goeden, BCDC
Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
Edward Hard, CDFA (pesticides)
George Nichol, retired (from Water Boards and Corps of Engineers)
Betty Yee, Central Valley Water Board
Lewis Moeller, DWR
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR

Via webinar:

Chuck Curtis, Region 6 Water Boards
Sidney Davis, Davis 2 Consulting Earth Scientists
Chris Huitt, California State Lands Commission
Greg Jaquez, Los Angeles County Flood
Edie Robbins, Civil Engineer
Jose Alarcon, DWR
Jennifer Morales, DWR
Mark Rivera, DWR

Facilitation: Lisa Beutler, MWH, Executive Facilitator; Charlotte Chorneau, CCP, Facilitation Support